



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/372,509 01/13/95 BISKER

D 6819/3

EXAMINER  
SANTA, R

15M2/1208

CHRISTOPHER M CAVAN  
WILLIAM BRINKS HOFER GILSON AND LIONE  
P O BOX 10395  
CHICAGO IL 60610

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1513

3

DATE MAILED: 12/08/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) month(s), \_\_\_\_\_ days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.                 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.                  |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.     | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____  |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☐ Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.
4. ☐ Claims 1-20 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received  
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Serial No. 372,509

-2-

Art Unit 1513

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the claims, the term "life-like" is indefinite. The term "like" is not proper claim language. In claim 11, "five mils thick or greater" is open ended.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Payne in view of Travis.

Payne teaches a photograph of a floor tile positioned on a display device. See column 1, lines 14-23. Payne does not mention enlargement of the print.

Travis discloses a wall ornament for showing and tub enclosures comprising a full-scale drawing, print or photograph

Serial No. 372,509


-3-


Art Unit 1513

of an object printed upon a sheet of moisture impervious synthetic paper which is affixed or mounted on a wall. See abstract.

Muzik discloses a graphic laminate for mounting a sheet-like article such as a photograph have a protective coating for various purposes e.g. for visual training aids, commercial artwork and other pictorial representation that may be mounted on a ceiling, vertically on a wall or horizontally on a table or floor. See Abstract, column 1, lines 9-16 and column 4, lines 32-34.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art motivated by the desire to produce a photographic floor tile to use a protective coating from Muzik and enlarge the photographic print from the teaching of Travis in Payne in order to achieve desirable printing results depending in the intended use.

  
PATRICK J. RYAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
Office 150

  
A. Bahta:jp  
December 02, 1995